

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-9, 12, and 14-49 are pending in the current application. Of those, claims 1 and 14-18 are independent claims. Claims 1 and 14-18 are amended by this Response. New claims 19-49 are added by this Response. Claims 2-5, 10-11, and 13 are canceled.

Telephone Interview

Applicant notes the telephone interview conducted on March 10, 2008 with Examiner Michael Choi. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his time and for discussing the claims and currently cited art. In particular, Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that he would reconsider the current rejections in light of the amendments to the claims contained in the present Response.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Maruyama et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,385,389, herein Maruyama). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner asserts at page 4 of the current Office Action that Maruyama discloses at FIG. 13 and col. 15, lines 31+ a playlist including navigation information providing presentation information regarding the first and second files. Maruyama discloses at col. 15, lines 31-38 that "FIG. 13 shows PCI packet 116 included in navigation pack 86 located at the beginning of each VOB 85. As shown in FIG. 13, PCI packet 116 includes presentation control information PCI (PCI data) 113 as navigation data used for changing the display or playback contents (presentation contents) in synchronism with the playback state of video data in video object unit (VOB) 85. Therefore, the presentation control information in Maruyama is included in the navigation pack 86 which is included in the VOB 85 with the video and audio data.

Maruyama further discloses at col. 12 lines 11-18 “Each video object unit 85 is constituted as a set (pack sequence) of video packs (V packs) 88, sub-picture packs (SP packs 90), and audio packs (A packs) 91 to have navigation pack (NV pack) 86 at the beginning of the sequence. That is, video object unit VOB 85 is defined as a set of all packs recorded from certain navigation pack 86 to a pack immediately before the next navigation pack 86.” Therefore, as shown in FIG. 11, the video packs 88, the sub-picture packs 90, and the audio packs 91 after the first navigation pack 86 until the next navigation pack 86 are for the first navigation pack 86 and stored in the same VOB in the same area of the recording medium. Therefore, Maruyama fails to disclose “a data area storing at least one still image in a first file and audio data in a second file; and a playlist area storing at least one playlist, the playlist linking the first and second files, wherein the playlist includes navigation information providing presentation information regarding the first and second files...and **the data area is separate from the playlist area**” as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is patentable for at least the above reasons. Further, Applicant submits that claims 14-18 include features somewhat similar to those discussed above in regards to amended claim 1, and therefore, claims 14-18 are patentable for at least somewhat similar reasons as claim 1. Applicant also respectfully submits that claims 6-9 and 12, which depend from amended claim 1, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above in regards to amended claim 1 as well as on their own merits.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

New Claims

New Claims 19-49, which depend from one of claims 1, 15, 16, 17, and 18, are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above in regard to claim 1, as well as on their own merits.

For example, Applicant respectfully submits that Maruyama fails to disclose “the first file is separate from the second file” as required by claim 19 and that “the one of the playitem field and the sub-playitem field providing the first navigation information does not provide navigation information for both still images and audio data” as required by claim 20. To the contrary, the first navigation pack 86 in FIG. 11 of Maruyama is for all of the video packs 88, the sub-picture packs 90, and the audio packs 91 until the next navigation pack at the beginning of the next video object unit 85. Therefore, the same navigation pack 86 is for both the sub-picture packs 90 and the audio packs 91 in each a video object unit 85.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of the claims in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.


Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$120.00 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By  _____
Aaron A. Mace, Reg. No. 61,812

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/AAM: tlt